



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,872	01/11/2001	Eugene Wang	3284.1	9771

22886 7590 09/26/2002

AFFYMETRIX, INC
ATTN: CHIEF IP COUNSEL, LEGAL DEPT.
3380 CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY
SANTA CLARA, CA 95051

EXAMINER

MARTINELL, JAMES

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1631

DATE MAILED: 09/26/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/758,872

Applicant(s)

WANG ET AL.

Examiner

James Martinell

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

Art Unit: 1631

The Art Unit location of your application in the USPTO has changed. To aid in correlating any papers for this application, all further correspondence regarding this application should be directed to Art Unit 1631.

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01. Hyperlinks and/or other forms of browser-executable code are found in at least the following locations:

- (a) page 14, line 5 and
- (b) page 20, lines 16-17.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are vague, indefinite, and incomplete.

- (a) The recitation of "the hybridization" (claims 1, 13, 18, 30, 35, and 47) is incomplete because there is no antecedent basis for a hybridization assay or step.
- (b) The recitation of "relative allele signal" (claims 6, 23, and 40) is vague and indefinite because the term is not defined in the application and the term has no recognized definition in the art.
- (c) Claim 31 is vague and indefinite because it depends from itself.
- (d) Claim 42 is vague and indefinite because it depends from itself.

Art Unit: 1631

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-6, 13-23, and 30-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al (Science 280: 1077 (1998)) in view of Sapolsky et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,858,659). Wang et al teaches the genotyping of SNPs using probes immobilized probes in a nucleic acid molecular hybridization assay (*e.g.* see abstract). Wang et al also teaches the analysis of alleles (page 1077, column 3), homozygotes and heterozygotes (page 1078, columns 2 and 3 and Figure 3), and the use of a genotyping algorithm (pages 1080-1081). Sapolsky et al teaches the use of computer methods to analyze nucleic acid molecular hybridization data (*e.g.* see columns 6-10 and Appendix A and applicants' admitted state of the prior art (instant application, page 1, lines 23-26). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the computer methods of Sapolsky et al to the assays of Wang et al in order to analyze data more efficiently than by manual means.

Claims 7-12 and 24-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al (Science 280: 1077 (1998)) in view of Sapolsky et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,858,659) as applied to claims 1-6, 13-23, and 30-51 above, and further in view of Lockhart et al (Nature Biotechnology 14: 1675


Art Unit: 1631

(1996)). Lockhart et al teaches nucleic acid molecular hybridization assays using high density immobilized probes (DNA chips) within the ranges required by the claims. For example, see page 1675, column 1 which discloses probe densities of 16,000 per 1.6 cm² (10,000 probes per cm²) and 65,000 probes per 1.6 cm² (40,625 probes per cm²). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the high density DNA chips of Lockhart et al in the method discussed in the previous rejection in order to analyze more sequence data in a given hybridization trial.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James Martinell whose telephone number is (703) 308-0296. The fax phone number for Examiner Martinell's desktop workstation is (703) 746-5162. The examiner works a flexible schedule and can be reached by phone and voice mail. Alternatively, a request for a return telephone call may be e-mailed to james.martinell@uspto.gov. Since e-mail communications may not be secure, it is suggested that information in such requests be limited to name, phone number, and the best time to return the call.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on (703) 305-4028. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.


James Martinell, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1631